

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/270,256	KLEBANOV, ILYA
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ryan R. Yang	2672

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ryan R. Yang.

(3) Kenji Ono

(2) Christopher Reckamp.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 26 October 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 21.

Identification of prior art discussed: Wada

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Applicants explained invention and language in claim 21. Applicants agree to change the claim language to better reflect the invention. Examiner agrees to review the draft to determine if it overcomes the Wada reference

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required